

U.S. Application No. 09/870,305 – Filed: May 30, 2001  
Proposed Amendment Dated: April 19, 2004  
Reply to Office Action Dated: January 22, 2004

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Final Office Action dated January 22, 2004, the Examiner has objected to the Specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claimed subject matter, to the Drawings for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, and to Claims 12 and 26 on formal grounds. Further, the Examiner has rejected Claims 22, 23, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Examiner has kindly indicated that Claims 1 and 3-11 are allowed, that Claims 24, 25, 27, 29, and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection as set forth in this Final Office action and to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New sheets of formal drawings, amending FIGS. 6 and 8a have been submitted. Identified copies of the new sheets of drawings are attached hereto for Examiner's approval per the new guidelines set for Amendments. By this paper, it has been proposed that the Specification, and Claims 12 and 22 be amended to more particularly point out that which the Applicant regards as the invention. Further, it is proposed that Claims 23, 24, 26, and 28 be cancelled without prejudice. For the reasons set forth fully below, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 12, 22, 25, 27, 29, and 30, the claims remaining in this Application, as amended, are allowable.

With regard to the specific objection to the Specification for lack of antecedent basis for “an odd row and an even row”, the discussion found on pages 35 and 36 was intended to be directed to a relative step between even and odd pixels. It has been proposed that the Specification, on page 35, be amended as indicated to give clear definition and antecedent basis of even and odd rows. With such amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the Specification has been overcome, and should now be removed.

With regard to the specific objection to the Drawings for failure to show “first and second circuits”, the Specification describes such first and second circuits. It has been proposed that new FIGS. 6 and 8a be entered, which specifically call out the elements that define the first and second circuits. With such amendment, it is respectfully

U.S. Application No. 09/870,305 – Filed: May 30, 2001  
Proposed Amendment Dated: April 19, 2004  
Reply to Office Action Dated: January 22, 2004

submitted that the objection to the Drawings has been overcome, and should now be removed.

By this paper, it is proposed that Claim 12 be amended as suggested by the Examiner, and Claim 22 be amended to add the allowable subject matter found in Claim 24, and Claims 22, 23, 24, and 26 be cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the Specification and Drawings are now respectfully considered to be in acceptable form, and Claims 12, 22, 24, 27, 29, and 30, when amended as proposed, are believed to be allowable.

Applicants are not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.99.

As now presented, this Application, when amended in the manner proposed, is believed to be in condition for favorable reconsideration and early allowance, and such actions are respectfully requested. If, upon considering the content of this paper, the Examiner concludes that there are open issues, which remain, it is kindly requested that the amendment be entered as placing this Application in better form for Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Lawrence P. Kessler  
Registration No. 24,637  
Telephone No. (585) 253-0123  
Facsimile No. (585) 726-0894

LPK:dn  
Attachment(s)  
NexPress Solutions LLC  
1447 St. Paul Street  
Rochester, NY 14653-7103